



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/082,709 02/25/2002 Hiroyuki Minaguchi PW 0284610 5317 27496 **EXAMINER** 7590 03/01/2004 PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q 725 S. FIGUEROA STREET **SUITE 2800** ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER LOS ANGELES, CA 90017 2835

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/082,709	MINAGUCHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anthony Q. Edwards	2835
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		•
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 F	ebruary 2002.	
	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4)	wn from consideration. is/are rejected. to.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2002 is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2015.	re: a) accepted or b) objected or b) objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receive tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-032) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date two (2) attached. 	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2835

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14, 16-18, 21-23, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,675,865 to Yoshida, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,467,527 to Kubota et al. Referring to claims 1, 5 and 14, Yoshida discloses a housing (60) used for an electronic apparatus (50), which inherently houses a functional part (e.g., a display) comprising: an outer or support wall (20) formed by injecting a metal material into a molding space (12) in a metal die (11). See Fig. 4 and the corresponding specification. Yoshida also discloses the outer wall (20) including first end portion situated on an upstream end along a flowing direction of the metal material, a second end portion situated on a downstream end of the flowing direction of the metal material, and an injection portion formed on the first end portion where at least one gate is of the metal die is inherently situated, forming a space (not numbered) between the first end portion and the injection portion (see Fig. 5 and 8, and the corresponding specification).

Yoshida does not specifically disclose injecting the metal material from a plurality of gates into the molding space (12). Kubota et al. disclose a pressure die-casting process, wherein a plurality of gates is provided for molten metal (see col. 9, lines 15-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the

injection molding device of Yoshida with an injection system having a plurality of gates as taught by Kubota et al., to limit the amount of molten metal flow into the mold cavity.

Referring to claim 10, Yoshida in view of Kubota et al. disclose the housing as claimed, including the support wall being inherently configured to support a functional part (e.g., a display), wherein the support wall includes a pair of projecting portions (not numbered) projecting from the support wall at intervals (see the marked-up copy of Fig. 8).

Referring to claims 6, 12 and 16, Yoshida in view of Kubota et al. inherently disclose a functional part or display unit (see Fig. 1 and the corresponding specification) as claimed, having a display panel (not shown) situated between the first end portion and the second end portion of the support wall.

Referring to claim 21, Yoshida in view of Kubota et al. disclose the housing as claimed, including a display panel (not shown, but inherent) situated between the first end portion and the second end portion of the support wall, and a computer main body having a keyboard, the main body being in electric communication with the display panel. See Fig. 1 and "Description of Related Art" section.

Referring to claims 2, 7, 17 and 22, Yoshida in view of Kubota et al. disclose the housing having a display unit and/or panel as claimed, wherein the injection portion includes first and second edge portions that extend from the first end portion towards the second end portion and facing each other, and a third edge portion bridged between a distal end of the first edge portion and a distal end of the second edge portion. See the marked-up copy of Fig. 8.

Referring to claims 3, 8, 18 and 23, Yoshida in view of Kubota et al. disclose the housing having a display unit and/or panel as claimed, wherein the metal material is a magnesium alloy

Art Unit: 2835

and is injected in a half-molten state into the molding space of the metal die. See Fig. 4 and col. 4, lines 29-38.

Referring to claim 4, Yoshida in view of Kubota et al. disclose the housing as claimed, wherein said plurality of gates of the metal die are arranged at intervals along the first edge portion to the third edge portion. See Fig. 8 of Yoshida and col. 9, lines 15-25 of Kubota et al.

Referring to claim 11, Yoshida in view of Kubota et al. disclose the housing as claimed, including the first end portion being situated on an upstream end along a flowing direction of the metal material, a second end portion situated on a downstream end of the flowing direction of the metal material. See Fig. 5 and 8, and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claims 26 and 28, the recited method steps are inherently necessitated by the apparatus structure as disclosed by Yoshida in view of Kubota et al. (see col. 6, lines 7-54).

Claims 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Kubota et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 072,274 to Jondrow. Yoshida, as modified, discloses the invention as claimed, except for the display being a liquid crystal display (LCD) panel. Jondrow discloses a molded LCD panel (30) for use in an electronic apparatus, such as a PC. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the display unit of the portable computer of Yoshida in view of Kubota et al. with an LCD panel as taught by Jondrow, to reduce the overall weight of the computer system.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9, 13, 15, 20, 25 and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the apparatus and corresponding method claim(s) recite a housing formed by injection molding, wherein an injection portion of a support wall is covered by a synthetic-resin made cover, and the cover is fixed to the support wall by a plurality of locations along a first edge portion to a third edge portion of the injection portion. These features, in combination with the rest of the elements or steps, are not taught or suggested by the art references.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: U.S. Patent Application Publication Nos. US2002/0044410 to Nakano et al. and US2001/0003017 to Hosoi et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Q. Edwards whose telephone number is 571-272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-3:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on 571-272-2800, ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/082,709 Page 6

Art Unit: 2835

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

February 10, 2004 aqe

DARREN SCHUBERG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800